

EXHIBIT A

1 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
2 MJacobs@mofo.com
3 ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ (CA SBN 121490)
4 AGonzález@mofo.com
5 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
6 425 Market Street
7 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
8 Tel: 415.268.7000 / Fax: 415.268.7522
9
10 KAREN L. DUNN (*Pro Hac Vice*)
11 kdunn@bsflp.com
12 MICHAEL BRILLE (*Pro Hac Vice*)
13 mbrille@bsflp.com
14 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
15 1401 New York Avenue, N.W.
16 Washington, D.C. 20005
17 Tel: 202.237.2727 / Fax: 202.237.6131

18 WILLIAM CARMODY (*Pro Hac Vice*)
19 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
20 SHAWN RABIN (*Pro Hac Vice*)
21 srabin@susmangodfrey.com
22 SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
23 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
24 New York, NY 10019-6023
25 Tel: 212.336.8330 / Fax: 212.336.8340

26
27
28
15 Attorneys for Defendants
16 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
and OTTOMOTTO LLC

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

21 WAYMO LLC,
22 Plaintiff,
23 vs.
24 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and
OTTOMOTTO LLC,
25 Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939

**DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF THE
CASE**

Judge: The Honorable William Alsup
Trial Date: February 5, 2018

1 Pursuant to Paragraph 8 of the Court's Guidelines for Trial and Final Pretrial Conference
 2 in Civil Jury Cases (last revised May 8, 2017), Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc. and Ottomotto
 3 LLC provide the following joint statement of the case to be read to the jury during voir dire:

4 **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

5 This is a case about trade secrets relating to self-driving car technology. The plaintiff, the
 6 entity that brought this case, is Waymo LLC. Waymo is a subsidiary of Google's parent company,
 7 Alphabet Inc. During this trial, Waymo may sometimes be referred to as "Google," and the self-
 8 driving car project at Google as "Project Chauffeur" or "Chauffeur." The defendants in this case
 9 are Uber Technologies, Inc. and Ottomotto LLC. During this trial, Ottomotto may sometimes be
 10 referred to as "Otto."

11 Waymo asserts that it owns eight separate trade secrets relating to something called
 12 LiDAR, which is technology that is used in some self-driving vehicles. Waymo accuses Uber and
 13 Ottomotto of misappropriating those eight Waymo trade secrets. Waymo asserts that Uber and
 14 Ottomotto's misappropriation of its trade secrets damaged Waymo and caused Uber and
 15 Ottomotto to be unjustly enriched. Waymo also claims that Uber and Ottomotto misappropriated
 16 its trade secrets willfully and maliciously.

17 Uber and Ottomotto deny Waymo's claims. Uber and Ottomotto deny that any of
 18 Waymo's alleged trade secrets are actual trade secrets. Uber and Ottomotto also deny that they
 19 misappropriated any of the alleged trade secrets. Uber and Ottomotto further deny that Waymo
 20 was damaged or that Uber or Ottomotto were unjustly enriched.

21 To be clear, the claims and defenses just described merely summarize the parties'
 22 arguments—the parties themselves will explain their positions at trial and the evidence presented
 23 will provide the facts.

24 To succeed on its claim for unjust enrichment based on alleged misappropriation of any
 25 given Alleged Trade Secret, Waymo must prove all of the following:

26 ***[The following is taken directly from Instruction IV of the Court's Penultimate Jury
 27 Instructions (Dkt 2449 at 2-3)]***

28 1. That the Alleged Trade Secret qualified as an enforceable trade secret at the time

1 it was allegedly misappropriated;

2 2. That the defendant improperly acquired, then used or disclosed

3 the Alleged Trade Secret;

4 3. That the defendant was thereby unjustly enriched; and

5 4. That such use or disclosure was a substantial factor in unjustly enriching the
6 defendant.

7 No defendant may be held liable for a damage award as to any given Alleged Trade Secret
8 unless all of these elements of proof are satisfied as to that defendant and as to that given Alleged
9 Trade Secret. It is for you, the jury, to decide whether or not all of these elements have been
10 proven for all of the Alleged Trade Secrets, for some of them, or for none of them.

11 This is only a summary, you will be instructed on the specific questions you should
12 address at the end of the parties' presentations.

13

14 Dated: January 29, 2018

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP

16

17

By: /s/ William Christopher Carmody
WILLIAM CHRISTOPHER CARMODY

18

19

Attorneys for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and
OTTOMOTTO LLC

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28